Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.,

ASSAY DEPARTMENT,

June 23, 1888

Sir

In the letter of the Director of the Mint of June 22 - 1888 - there is a statement as follows, "that a melting charge should be imposed on all Gold deposits from the small assay offices, whenever a separate melt is made".

I would state that we invariably impose the melting charge whenever a separate melt is made, but we do not make a charge when we make no melt.

The instructions and regulations (Art. 4, Page 7), state - "The charges shall be collected only when the character of the bullion deposited or purchased requires the operations to be performed."

A large proportion of the deposits received from the Assay Offices are not melted

Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.,

ASSAY DEPARTMENT,

....., 188

as it is not necessary for that operation to be performed, - therefore we do not impose a melting charge.

In the deposits of Dec. 30 - (the ones mentioned in the letter), assay Nos. 2485, 86, 87 & 88 were not melted, No 2489 was melted and a charge for same made.

In the letter there is no positive instruction in regard to re-melting all Re-deposits, and therefore to go by the printed instructions furnished, I cannot make a melting charge unless an actual melt is made at this mint.

Very Respectfully

Jacob B. Eckfeldt

Assayer

Hon. Daniel M. Fox

Superintendent

NARA RG104, Entry 1, Box 152

Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.,
Assay Department,
June 23, 1888

Sir

In the letter of the Director of the Mint of June 22 1888 there is a statement as follows; "that a melting charge should be imposed on all gold deposits from the small assay officer, whenever a separate melt is made". I would state that we invariably implore the melting charge whenever a separate melt is made, but we do not make a charge when we make no melt. The instructions and regulations (Art 1, Page 7), state. "The charges shall be collected only when the character of the bullion deposited or purchased requires the operations to be performed to. A large proportion of the deposits received from the Assay Offices are not melted as it is not necessary for the operation to be performed, therefore we do not implore a melting charge.

In the deposits of Dec. 30 – (the ones mentioned in the letter), assay Nos. 2485, 86, 87 & 88 were not melted, No. 2489 was melted and a charge for same made.

In the letter there is no positive instruction in regard to re-melting all re-deposits, and therefore to go by the printed instructions furnished, I cannot make a melting charge unless an actual melt is made at this mint.

Very Respectfully,
Jacob B. Eckfeldt
Assayer

Hon. Daniel M. Fox
Superintendent